

*Family Allowances Act*

cooperate with us or to supply us with specific information in specific cases where we have requested it. The proviso merely gives the administration an alternative in any case where the provincial authorities, after having been asked for information, fail to supply it.

If this ever occurs, the proviso in the amending clause makes it possible for the governor in council to prescribe an alternative method by which such information may be obtained. Presumably the governor in council, if such a situation ever arose, could pass a regulation authorizing the regional director of family allowances in the province concerned to make the decision himself on any matter of school attendance or equivalent training which ordinarily the provincial educational authorities will be asked to make for us.

Mr. FLEMING: It is quite clear from the statement just made that the proviso in the new section 4(2a) is not to take care of any situation that exists at the moment, and that there is no occasion in mind to apply it?

Mr. McCANN: That is right.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I should like to be clear about children who are not attending school because of physical or mental disabilities. Would they still be eligible for the family allowance, provided that they are maintained by their parents or guardians?

Mr. McCANN: That would be accepted as a legitimate excuse from school attendance and therefore they would receive the allowance.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: That would be a justifiable excuse?

Mr. McCANN: Yes.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: In remote areas where no schools are available, if the parents or guardians did not take advantage of the correspondence course the child might receive no education whatsoever. Would such child still be eligible for the family allowance?

Mr. McCANN: The department would accept the judgment of the educational authorities as to whether or not school facilities were available.

Mr. HERRIDGE: Paragraph (b) deals with a child who ceases to be resident in Canada. Has the minister given consideration to special circumstances or special cases? I am thinking of a girl in my constituency, the child of people of very modest means who suffers from a peculiar nervous affection. The child is highly intelligent and normal in every other way; but on account of this affection she has to be sent to the United States to school, either in the state of Washington or in California, to

[Mr. McCann.]

receive instruction and treatment. I brought this case to the attention of the minister last fall, but it was not possible under the act then for these parents to receive the family allowance for the child. It would seem that this amendment makes no change in the law in that respect. The child's parents are not well off but are in very modest circumstances and the family allowance would be a great help to them. They cannot help the condition of the child, and they are doing all they can to assist her, straining their resources to the limit. Is special consideration given to that type of case?

Mr. McCANN: The practice has been that where the child is resident outside Canada for a period of not more than three months the child is considered resident in Canada for the purpose of the family allowance plan, but where the period is longer than that the grant under the present act does not apply.

Mr. HERRIDGE: It is impossible for the parents to bring the child home and send her back again to school in order to comply with the act. I think special consideration should be given to cases of that type.

Mr. CAMPBELL: How are the children of Indians and Eskimos in remote areas taken care of, also the children of Indians on reserves where there are no convenient schools? The correspondence course would be almost impossible for them to take, because the Indian parents are not able to read or write and could not pass on the correspondence courses to the children. The minister mentioned the Indian affairs branch. Is that the branch which would decide whether these children in remote areas are eligible for the allowance?

Mr. McCANN: We rely entirely on the judgment of the Department of Mines and Resources, which is responsible for the Eskimos and Indians.

Mr. FLEMING: With regard to the new subsection 2 (a), providing that the allowance shall cease to be payable when the child ceases to be maintained by a parent, what interpretation has the department given to the word "maintained"? Has a ceiling been placed on a child's earnings as a condition of eligibility for the allowance?

Mr. McCANN: That is clearly set out in the regulations. I will read the regulation which covers it, regulation 12, under part IV:

(1) A parent shall be deemed to maintain a child substantially so long as the amount or value of the contributions made by such parent, in cash or in kind, for the maintenance, care, training, education and advancement of such child, exclusive of the allowance is \$5 or more per month, and provided such amount or value